

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL
NOMENCLATURE

Minutes of special meeting at Stensoffa Ecological Field Station,
University of Lund, Sweden,
15-18 August, 1979. Z.N.(G) 182

Present: Dr. C.W. Sabrosky, President, in the chair; Messrs. Alvarado, Bernardi, Brinck, Cogger, Corliss, Heppell, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Nye, Ride, Welch and the Secretary.

1. Dr. Ride, as President of the Editorial Committee, presented the Committee's interim report to the Commission. He outlined the history of the committee's work since its establishment at Ustaoset, Norway, in 1973 up to the publication of the committee's 6th draft of the third edition of the Code in November 1977. Copies of the 8th draft were laid before the members present.

2. Dr. Ride explained the formal procedures for completing the third edition of the Code. Some proposals for major changes to the second edition had been published for over a year and had been voted on by the Commission (see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 66-67). Others had been published but could not be voted on under Article 16 of the Constitution until a year after their publication and after consideration of comments by zoologists. He proposed that the Commission should ask the Section on Zoological Nomenclature at the Helsinki meeting of IUBS to recommend to the Division of Zoology that the Commission be authorised to write into the Code each of those propositions that received an eventual favourable vote from the Commission. Any proposals rejected by the Commission as a whole in a postal vote would not go forward. However, the Section on Zoological Nomenclature had the right to veto any of those proposals, and if it did so the Commission could not vote on them. In that event, the relevant passage of the second edition would remain in force.

3. The final text of the Code, to be voted on by the Commission, would be presented to the Board of the Division of Zoology for final approval or rejection on 1 August 1980, the same date as the start of the final vote by the Commission. The Board, however, could only accept or reject the Code as a whole – and could reject it only on the ground that it did not represent faithfully what the Section had intended.

4. Meanwhile, the 7th draft of the third edition had been circulated to the Commission and the 8th draft was before the meeting. However, neither the special meeting at Stensoffa, nor the general meeting at Helsinki, nor the Section on Zoological Nomenclature at Helsinki would vote on a definitive text. All those votes would be on the principle involved in each proposal; the final wording would still remain to be decided by the Commission voting on a draft prepared by the Editorial Committee.

5. The fact that the Commission had voted favourably on the proposed changes in the Constitution was reported.

6. The Secretary reported on the current financial position and outlined his policy for the future. He gave his estimate of the situation that the Commission might expect to find at Helsinki. Dr. Ride outlined the problems facing the Commission's resolution on financial support. There was some risk that the Australian delegation's motion on examination of the structure of IUBS might delay implementation of the Commission's resolution, if adopted. Professor Brinck mentioned the possibility of financial support being obtained through the Taxonomy Committee of the European Research Councils and the European Science Foundation.

7. The Commission then turned to the report of the Editorial Committee. This presented four sets of proposals: List A included 14 points on which the Commission had voted in Voting Paper (79) 1. All had received the necessary two-thirds majority support and would be reported to the Section on Zoological Nomenclature at Helsinki for incorporation into the Code. List B presented 30 proposals for major changes in the Code. All had been published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* and were recommended by the committee, but some had not been published long enough for a vote to be taken, while others, though ready for voting, had been deferred for further discussions. List C contained 18 proposals on which the Editorial Committee either made no recommendation, or which they recommended against. List D contained two items: the question of the adoption of the term 'epithet' in the Code, and the possible rationalisation of the use of the term 'nominal taxon' in the Code. These did not involve changing any mandatory part of the Code but would have a profound effect on its presentation.

8. The Commission first reviewed the decisions already voted on and included in List A. It then examined lists B and C together, transferring some proposals from one list to the other. The revised List B was adopted for presentation to the General Meeting of the Commission at Helsinki. The proposal in List D on the use of the term 'epithet' was adopted; that concerning the term 'nominal

taxon' was deferred.

The meeting closed with a splendid supper party at which votes of thanks were offered to Professor Brinck for making the excellent accommodation at the Stensoffa Field Station available, and to his staff for the devotion and hard work they had put into the organisation of the meeting. All were agreed that the meeting had taken place in ideal conditions which had allowed much good work to be done.

Minutes of general meeting at Helsinki, Finland
20-24 August, 1979. Z.N.(G) 189

Present: Dr. C.W. Sabrosky, President, in the chair; Messrs. Alvarado, Bernardi, Brinck, Cogger, Corliss, Dupuis, Heppell, Holthuis, Nye, Ride, Welch and the Secretary.

The minutes of the previous general meeting at Bangalore, 1976 (see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 33: 185-188) were confirmed.

The following agenda was adopted:

1. Confirmation of business conducted by the special meeting at Stensoffa/Lund
2. Preparation of slate of nominations for election to the Commission by the Section on Zoological Nomenclature
3. Composition of electoral committee to nominate two candidates for Vice-President
4. Date of election of new Council
5. Any other business

1. The provisional conclusions concerning proposed amendments to the Code reached by the special meeting of the Commission at Stensoffa, near Lund, 15-18 August 1979, were confirmed (they are appended at the end of these minutes).

2. The Commission considered candidates for nomination to the Section on Zoological Nomenclature for election to the Commission. These included five retiring members of the Commission (Eisenmann, Melville, Starobogatov, Bayer and Corliss) whose eligibility for renomination had been agreed by the Council, and three new candidates: Bousfield (Canada; Crustacea and Mollusca); Levine (U.S.A.; parasitic protozoa); Maurin (France; fisheries science). These names were arranged in pairs as follows:

*Starobogatov

:

Bousfield

*Bayer	:	Maurin
*Corliss	:	Levine
*Melville	:	unopposed

(The names marked with an asterisk are those of retiring members of the Commission.)

It was decided not to renominate *Eisenmann since he would reach the age of retirement before the next Congress. It was agreed that one place should be left vacant. The list was forwarded to the Section on Zoological Nomenclature with an indication of the Commission's preference for the names in the left-hand column.

3. Dr. Alvarado and Dr. Cogger were appointed as the ordinary members of the Commission who would join with the Council to form the nominating committee for the new Vice-President.

4. It was agreed that the procedure for electing the Vice-President should be set in motion about 21 August 1980, and that the election of the new Council should follow as soon as possible after the completion of that procedure.

5. At a subsequent session the following matters were considered:

- (a) that the question of the use of hyphens in the Code be submitted for a postal vote by the Commission as a whole (it was decided not to proceed to a postal vote);
- (b) those members present who were not members of the Editorial Committee were invited to work with the Glossary Committee in testing the definitions given in the Glossary;
- (c) that Dr. Welch should prepare a paper on collective-group names with special reference to those that were in use as the names of both collective groups and nominal genera, and to those first proposed expressly as collective-group names;
- (d) that Mr. Heppell and Dr. Nye should form a working group on the Official Lists and their titles;
- (e) that Mr. Heppell and the Secretary should form a working group on the provisions in the Constitution and Bylaws governing the election of members of the Commission;
- (f) that Mr. Heppell should convene a colloquium on zoological nomenclature at the ICSEB II conference at

Vancouver in 1980, and that the Secretary should give advance notice of this to all members of the Commission (it was also agreed that the conclusions of this colloquium would not be binding on the Commission).

Report of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Section on Zoological Nomenclature of the Division of Zoology of IUBS at Helsinki, Finland, August 1979 on proposals for major changes in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. Z.N.(G) 182

1. *Introduction.* Following the appointment of Dr. Sabrosky to be President of the Commission in 1977, the Editorial Committee to revise the Code was reconstituted with the following membership:—

Dr. W.D.L. Ride (Chairman)
Dr. G. Bernardi
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Mr. R.V. Melville
Dr. C.W. Sabrosky

Since the last meeting of the Commission (Bangalore, India, October 1976) the Committee has met twice: in London, May 1977; in London, July 1978. Otherwise its business has been conducted by correspondence.

On 1 November 1977, the Secretary of the Commission published a statement of the major changes to the Code that the Committee recommended be considered (*Bull.* vol. 34, pp. 167-173). At the same time the Committee's 6th Draft of the proposed 3rd Edition was published. Comments were sought on the contents of both documents. In October 1978, the Secretary of the Commission published (*Bull.* vol. 35, pp. 77-81) a further statement of changes proposed. (Although contained in the 6th Draft, these changes had not been itemized in the earlier article by the Secretary.)

In these articles the Committee had attempted to draw attention to all those changes proposed that it considered that the Commission would probably wish to treat as major changes to the Code (i.e. matter that did not merely clarify existing provisions — see Article 87 of the Code). Comments on the proposals, on the Draft generally, and on further proposals made by zoologists, have been published in subsequent parts of the *Bulletin* vols. 34, 35 and 36.

Since the time of completion of the 6th Draft, two further drafts have been completed incorporating the results of the Committee's deliberations on comments to date.

2. *Proposed major changes on which voting is complete.* On 14th March 1979 the Secretary called for a vote of the Commission in V.P.(79)1 on most of the proposed major changes that had become eligible, under the Constitution, to be voted upon. All were adopted by the Commission for recommendation to the Section on Nomenclature. They are listed at A below in general terms (references are also given to the provisions of the current Code that will be amended thereby).

3. *Other major changes recommended by the Committee.* On 29th June 1979 the Chairman of the Editorial Committee took a vote of the Committee on all other proposed major changes that were then under consideration by the Committee. The vote of the Committee was taken to provide a set of recommendations that could be brought to a Special Session of the Commission to provide a basis for discussion.

4. *Meeting of Special Session of the Commission at Lund.* In August 1979 (15th to 18th) the Commission met in Special Session at Lund and considered the proposals that the Committee recommended. It also considered other major changes that the Committee had considered.

5. *Presentation of Proposals to the Commission at Helsinki.* The Special Session recommended two lists of proposals for action by the Commission at Helsinki. List B (below) is recommended for presentation by the Commission to the Section on Nomenclature with the *recommendation* that the proposals in it be adopted for amendment of the 2nd Edition of the Code *subject* to their being individually adopted by a postal vote of the Commission. List C (below) contains proposals that the Special Session recommended against presentation for discussion, but the Special Session does not seek action on them before the next meeting of the Section at IUBS, 1982.

CURTIS W. SABROSKY
President

18 August 1979.

- A. Changes in the Code adopted by the Commission in VP(79)1 for recommendation to the Section on Nomenclature of the Division of Zoology (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 66-70)
1. That the Glossary will form part of the Code. Currently there is no provision to this effect. It will be incorporated in the Preamble (VP(79)1, Item 1).
 2. That, provided the Principle of Binominal Nomenclature applies in the work concerned, and other conditions for availability are satisfied, separate words referring to or representing a single entity be treated as an available compound epithet and written as one word without a hyphen. This provision defines compound epithet and clarifies Articles 11 g (i) and 26 a (VP(79)1, Item 4).
 3. That a new generic and a new specific name, proposed together as new after 1930, with a single description serving for both, are not made unavailable solely on the grounds that there are not separate descriptions that are presumed to differentiate or distinguish the taxa. If they satisfy the other provisions of the Code governing availability, such names would both be available. This provision clarifies the status of genus-group and species-group names that could be held to be not available under Article 13 a (i) because they have not been differentiated from one another in a single combined description (VP(79)1, Item 5).
 4. That a name for a new genus-group taxon accompanied by a bibliographic reference to an already available epithet shall provide an indication for the new name. This provision extends the meaning of the term "indication" in Article 16 a by expanding Art. 16 (a) (v). A new name proposed after 1930 only by such an indication would not thereby be made available (see, in particular, Art. 16 a (i) and (v)). (VP(79)1, Item 6).
 5. That the mandatory provision requiring the insertion of a comma between the name of an author and date, when these are cited with a name, be removed. The decision removes a mandatory provision (Art. 22) regarded as unnecessary. (VP(79)1, Item 7).
 6. That the provision (Article 29 d) preventing family-group names proposed before 1961 based upon incorrectly formed stems from being amended, if in general use, be deleted. (VP(79)1, Item 9).

7. That the terms 'correction' and 'mandatory change' be adopted for classes of subsequent spellings. This provision facilitates the structure and arrangement within Articles 32-34. Although included in the voting paper, it could have been treated by the Commission as one of clarification, rather than a major change (see Art. 77 a (iii)). (VP(79)1, Item 10).
8. That when a name of a family-group taxon is found to be invalid as a result of the homonymy of the generic name from which its stem is formed, the family-group name must be replaced by its next most senior synonym, or for want of such a name by a new family-group name derived from the valid name of the former type genus. This provision adds to Article 39. When there is no available, and potentially valid, family-group name the same zoological genus continues to be employed as the basis for the type genus (VP(79)1, Item 13).
9. That the author of a name first published before 1961 as a junior synonym is the person who published it as a synonym even if he attributed it to some other originator. The provision adds to Article 50 to enable authorship to be established. Doubt occurs because such a name becomes available as the result of the action of a *subsequent* author (Article 11 d) rather than through the act of the author who publishes it in synonymy (VP(79)1, Item 14a).
10. That the type series of a species-group taxon whose name was first published as a junior synonym and made available before 1961 is the specimen (or specimens) cited with that name when it was first published as a synonym, or, if none was then cited, the specimen (or specimens) associated with that name before it was published in synonymy. This decision provides a means (hitherto lacking in Articles 72, 73) of determining the types of species-group taxa whose names were made available through Article 11 d. (VP(79)1, Item 14b).
11. That the type species of a genus-group taxon whose name was first published before 1961 as a junior synonym and made available before 1961 is that nominal species (or one of the nominal species if there is more than one) first directly associated with it in a published work. This decision has the same effect for generic names as 10 above has for specific names. (VP(79)1, Item 14b).
12. That a name first proposed as an addition to follow a trinomen is of infrasubspecific rank and, as such, is excluded from

the provisions of the Code. This decision provides a further means, additional to those listed in Article 45 d, for determining infrasubspecific rank. (VP(79)1, Item 15).

13. That the following variant spellings be added to those listed as being deemed identical for purposes of homonymy between species-group names:
 - (a) the use of i and j for the same Latin letter,
 - (b) the use of u and v for the same Latin letter.

This decision refers to Article 58 (VP(79)1, Item 16).

14. That the name of a type species is its binomen (or trinomen) in its correct original spelling and original combination; it is to be so cited and not by a senior synonym or in a different combination. The decision causes the replacement of Article 67 e; that Article currently conflicts with the principle that the type of a genus-group taxon is an originally included nominal species-group taxon and that the name of such a taxon is its original binomen or trinomen (VP(79)1, Item 8 — see also Item B25 (below) for completion of the change).

B. Major changes recommended by the Special Session of the Commission for presentation to the Section to be adopted subject to a subsequent postal vote by the Commission.

1. To provide that zoological nomenclature applies to the names of fossils of the work of animals or their traces (but not secretions), even though they have not been related to any organism in the animal kingdom that caused them. The term ichnotaxa is used to describe such entities. Article 1 of the Code provides for fossils of the work of animals and it is implicit in that Article that they must be regarded as representing taxonomic units of animals. Since some such fossils have never been related to the organism that have caused them the Code should state explicitly that zoological nomenclature applies to their names (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 11-14).
2. To provide that names given specially to ichnotaxa do not compete in priority at genus-group level with names given to nominal taxa of recognized organisms in the Animal Kingdom and that names given to ichnotaxa at the level of the genus group be treated as the names of collective groups. Names given specially to ichnotaxa would be treated at genus level in the same manner as collective groups and at any level,

- notwithstanding Art. 24 b (iii), they must not compete in priority with names given to taxa of the animals that made the work or traces (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 11-14)
3. To provide that zoological nomenclature applies to names given to fossils of fragmentary or detached parts of animals that are classified in artificial taxa as though they were genera and species. The term parataxa is used to describe such entities. At present Article 1 excludes from zoological nomenclature names that are not applied to "taxonomic units of animals known to occur in nature". Since dual nomenclatures exist in practice the matter would be made explicit in the Code (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 11-14).
 4. To provide that names given specifically to parataxa do not compete in priority with names given to nominal taxa of recognized organisms in the Animal Kingdom. As in the case of ichnotaxa (2 above), and notwithstanding Art. 24 b (i), the names of parataxa would not compete in priority.
 5. To provide that the generic name *Araneus* Clerck and epithets published in combination with it by Clerck in 1757 and made available for use in zoological nomenclature by the International Congress in 1948 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 4: 315-319) would have priority as though they were published subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature and in 1758 before the 10th Edition of the *Systema Naturae*. The Paris Congress decided to incorporate a provision in the Code to this effect, but the London Congress decided merely to make an entry referring to the work in the Official List of Works approved for use in Zoological Nomenclature (Direction 104, 1959, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 17: 89-91). The relative priority of names in *Aranei svecici* and *Systema Naturae* (10th Edn), and the year from which all names date, would be made explicit in Article 3 of the Code 'Starting Point'.
 6. That printing by ink on paper be no longer obligatory among the conditions that constitute publication. The provision that confines publication for the purposes of the Code to works printed only in ink on paper (Article 8(1)) would be removed because by modern technology other methods of printing are now common and, moreover, some of them may only be distinguished with difficulty from works produced by customary techniques. The question is part of the broader issue of what should constitute publication for the purposes of the Code and of the criteria of availability (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 168-169).

7. That the following be listed as methods that do not, if employed, constitute publication (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 168-169):
- (a) handwritten material at any time, and if reproduced as such by a mechanical process after 1930
 - (b) photographs as such except microcard and microfiche
 - (c) computer print-outs as such
 - (d) photocopies as such (e.g., xerography and other indirect electrostatic reproductions) unless such a method is used to reproduce a work that satisfies Article 8
 - (e) acoustic tapes and other acoustic recordings as such.

The provisions relating to publication present particular difficulty, mainly because the existing provisions do not reflect recent advances in printing technology that greatly facilitate the production of numerous identical copies of works that may meet the criteria of publication established in Article 8 of the Code. In an attempt to exercise some control over the quality of works, these methods would be added to those currently listed in Article 9.

8. That a provision be added to the criteria of availability of genus-group names to provide that, notwithstanding the existing provision that establishes subgeneric rank for names proposed for certain primary subdivisions of genera, a uninominal name proposed for a group of species is not made unavailable solely on the grounds that it was proposed for a secondary (or further) subdivision of a genus or subgenus. The present Article was adopted by the London (1958) Congress to meet a particular situation that did appear upsetting to stability. It is implicit in Article 11 f (ii) that names for secondary (and further) divisions of genera are not available. Considering, however, that such names are widespread, and that as they have been generally accepted, their suppression in toto would be even more disturbing, the restriction to primary divisions, even if only implicit, would be deleted. If a uninominal name, duly latinized and capitalized (and not merely a specific epithet), is proposed as a name for a group of species, there is no operational difference between it and a name proposed with the label "gen. nov." and hence no reason to treat it as anything other than a genus-group name even if it was labelled as the name of a "Section" or "Division" (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 78).

9. To require when an indication for a name proposed before 1931 consists of a bibliographic reference to a previously published description, definition or illustration, that the name so indicated must be treated as valid in the work in which both the name and the bibliographic reference occur. Under Article 12 and Article 16 a (i) an author prior to 1931 can make a previously unavailable name, or a newly proposed name, available by publishing with it as an indication a bibliographic reference to a previously published description. Such names would only become available by that action if, in the work in which the name and the reference are published together, the author has employed the name as a valid name. The provision is implicit in Article 1, but that fact can be overlooked.
10. To provide that the status of an unavailable name is not changed by mere citation (in synonymy or otherwise) of the name and a bibliographic reference to the work in which it was published in a manner that did not satisfy the criteria of availability. The Committee *recommends* that this matter be made explicit.
11. That a new generic and a new family name proposed together as new after 1930 with a single description serving for both are not made unavailable solely on the grounds that there are not separate descriptions that are presumed to differentiate or distinguish the taxa. If they satisfy the other provisions of the Code governing availability such names would both be available. Under Article 13a a name proposed after 1930 must, unless a replacement name, be accompanied by a statement that purports to give characters differentiating the taxon or by a bibliographic reference to such a statement. The Commission in VP(79)1 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 66-70) has voted to make generic and specific names characterised in a single combined description available after 1930 as well as before 1931 (unless they are not available for some other reason). The Committee *recommends* that the action relating to genus-group and species-group names be completed by accepting the same principle for family-group and genus-group names.
12. That an available compound epithet published as separate words based on the name of a place or a saint, one being an abbreviation, shall be amended by writing the abbreviation in full and uniting the parts; in one based on the name of any other person in which one part consists of an initial letter

separated from the rest by a hyphen or stop, the hyphen or stop would be deleted (if one is present) and the parts would be united. Since some compound epithets contain abbreviations, a decision must be made as to the procedure to be followed when uniting the abbreviation within the whole.

13. That adjectival epithets that are, or end in, Greek or words that are not Latin be treated as indeclinable. The requirement in Article 30 of the Code that an adjectival epithet must agree in gender with the generic name with which it is combined causes difficulty with epithets that are not of Latin origin. Epithets that are or end in Greek words, or words that are not Latin, or that are arbitrary combinations of letters, would be treated as indeclinable (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 170).
14. That genus-group names that are nouns of variable gender be treated as masculine irrespective of the gender of the noun from which they are derived and any statement by their authors. Genus-group names that are nouns of variable gender also give great difficulty under Article 30. Alternatives to the Committee's recommendation would be to assign to substantiated adjectives the gender of the noun from which they are derived, or to look to the usage of the original author. All would be treated as masculine (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 168–174).
15. That when an epithet formed from a personal name is a noun in the genitive case it is to be formed according to the rules of Latin grammar if the personal name is treated as a Latin word by the author. When it is not, the genitive is to be formed by adding to the stem of the name *-i* if it is that of a man, *-orum* if of men, or of man (men) and woman (women) together, *-ae* if of a woman, and *-arum* if of women. The old Règles, Art. 14c, provided, for epithets that are substantives in the genitive, that 'the genitive is formed in accordance with the rules of Latin declension in case the name was employed and declined in Latin', but 'if the name is a modern patronymic, the genitive is always formed by adding, to the exact and complete name, an *-i* if the person is a man, . . .' etc. The 1961 Code, Art. 31, appears to say the same thing, but it omits mention of the genitive: 'A species-group name, if a noun formed from a modern personal name, must end in *-i* if the personal name is that of a man, . . .' etc. At the International Congress of Zoology in Washington in 1963, it was held that this Article required too many changes in the

spelling of long-accepted names, and the Article was changed to the Recommendation 31A ('should usually end in . . .') of the present Code. For the sake of promoting consistency in the formation of names the Article would be restored for epithets that are nouns in the genitive case formed from personal names (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 79).

16. That a change in the original spelling of a name shall only be interpreted as 'demonstrably intentional' (and hence be an emendation) when, in the work itself, there is an explicit statement of intention, or when both the original and the changed spelling are cited and the latter is adopted in place of the former, or when two or more names in the same work are treated in a similar way. Information derived from an author's or publisher's corrigenda would be admissible. In order to determine whether a change in the subsequent spelling of a name is an emendation (and hence possibly, technically, an available name in its own right) the Code Article 33 a (ii) requires zoologists to determine whether a change is demonstrably intentional. When the change is only implicitly intentional a rigorous test would be made mandatory (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 80).
17. That a family-group name based on an unjustified emendation of a generic name is an incorrect original spelling and must be corrected. Under Article 40 it is implicit that, when a family name is found after 1960 to be based upon an invalidly emended generic name, the spelling of the family name continues to follow the secondary form of the generic name, while the name of the type genus reverts to its original form. In such cases the spelling of the name of the family group would automatically change in conformity with that of the type genus (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 80).
18. That in the case of scientific names spelled with an umlaut when originally proposed, if there is any doubt that the name is based on a German word, that it be so treated. It is also proposed that any names proposed with umlauts after the publication of the 3rd Edition be treated by deleting the umlaut irrespective of origin. The Code Article 32 c (i) provides that all diacritic marks on letters in scientific names originally published with such marks are to be deleted, with the exception of scientific names based on German words originally spelled with an umlaut, where *ä*, *ö* and *ü* are replaced by *ae*, *oe*, and *ue* respectively. Article 27 requires names to be spelled without diacritic marks. It is intended

that the proposed amendment to Article 32 will encourage zoologists forming new names to transliterate according to some preferred system before publishing them (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 170-171).

19. That the use of either of the terms 'variety' or 'form' with a name of the species-group published before 1961 is to be interpreted as denoting subspecific rank unless it is clear from the context of the work in which the name was first published that the author was using the name to denote an infrasubspecific taxon. The status of names treated as subspecific by authors observing the mandatory provisions of Article 45 e (i) of the Code concerning the interpretation of the terms 'variety' and 'form' would be maintained. The Code Article 45 e (i) currently makes it mandatory for names published before 1961 with the terms 'variety' or 'form' to be treated as of subspecific rank. In some groups large numbers of names were used to characterize mere colour variants and their introduction into nomenclature would greatly complicate homonymy without any benefit. The provision permits discretion in the case of such names.
20. That in an epithet formed from the genitive of a personal name the subsequent use of the termination *-i* in place of the termination *-ii* used in the original spelling (and vice versa) constitutes an incorrect subsequent spelling even if clearly deliberate. It is well known that there is divided opinion as to whether such names should be treated as permissible alternatives, or even whether the Code should dictate that only the termination *-i* should be used whatever the stem. Currently the Code Article 32 requires the original spelling to be used. The Committee does not recommend that this be changed. However, some names that are Latin names or that have been put into Latin form and that correctly terminate in *-ii* have been emended by dropping one *i*. Except for purposes of Homonymy (Art. 58(10)) such names may be available where the emendation is deliberate. In order to avoid the seeking out and recording of such variants in synonymies and nomenclators they would be treated as though they were incorrect subsequent spellings and without nomenclatural status (cf. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 171).
21. A generic name that has come to be used as the name of a collective group may continue in that use notwithstanding that the taxon has a type species. The Code Article 11 f (i) provides that names for collective groups are treated as

generic names, and that collective groups require no type-species (Art. 42 c). However, names that have become used for collective groups may be already available names for genera with type species fixed. It is undesirable to require such names to be placed in synonymy with names validly used for other genus-group taxa and removed from the collective groups to which they are applied. While such a name is in use for a collective group, it would be treated as though it has no type.

22. That an epithet may be added in parentheses after the genus-group name, or be inserted in parentheses between the generic name and the specific epithet to represent a group of species; and an additional epithet may be placed in parentheses between the specific and subspecific epithets to represent a group of subspecies within a species; such epithets, which must always be printed with a lower-case initial letter, are not counted in the number of words in a binomen or trinomen. In some parts of the animal kingdom (notably in Lepidoptera) it has been found useful to employ epithets supplementary to a binomen or trinomen to distinguish groups of species and groups of subspecies. The practice would be formalized in the Code, but not to the extent of creating new ranks of species-group taxa (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 71).
23. To provide that a junior secondary homonym replaced before 1961 is permanently invalid unless the Commission rules otherwise. The Code Article 59 b (i) stipulates that if the use of a replacement name for a junior homonym replaced before 1961 is contrary to existing usage, existing usage is to be maintained and the matter referred to the Commission. Discretion would be given to an author as to whether to refer such a matter to the Commission. If the author discovering the situation, or another author, considers that the matter should be referred to the Commission, and does so, existing usage would be maintained under Article 80 until the decision of the Commission is published. In the case of junior secondary homonyms that have not been replaced (even if the homonymy had not been overlooked), but are no longer considered to be in the same genus with the senior homonym, replacement would not take place except by a zoologist who believes that the two species-group taxa are congeneric (Art. 59 c) (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 81).
24. That the type species of a new genus-group taxon cited by an

infrasubspecific name in combination with an available species-group name is the nominal species-group taxon so cited; it is not the infrasubspecific form there named. The Code Article 69 a (i) makes it clear that it was the intention that a nominal species may be designated type of a genus (Article 67 a) by citing its name at any rank in the species group. But the provision is ambiguous and implies that varietal names and the names of 'forms' may be eligible when infrasubspecific. The matter would be placed beyond doubt by a provision that makes it explicit that if an infrasubspecific name is cited 'in combination' with a species-group name, whether cited as a binomen or trinomen, the type species so designated is that nominal species-group taxon denoted by the binomen or trinomen respectively.

25. That a designation of a type species made in contravention of the provision that the name of a type species is the binomen (or trinomen) in its correct original spelling and original combination would be valid but the name of the type species should be correctly cited by subsequent authors. In VP(79)1 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 66-70) the Commission adopted a recommendation that the name of a type species is the binomen or trinomen in its correct original spelling and original combination (see A14 above). This addition completes the provision.
26. To provide that in extant species of protozoa, when a taxon cannot be differentiated by a single individual, a number of preserved individuals forming, or presumed to form, a clone and presented in a single preparation may be designated as a holotype or neotype, or selected as a lectotype. Such specimens would have the status of such a type (not syntypes). In consequence of full discussion with protozoologists (the International Congresses of Protozoology and Parasitology), provision would be made in Article 73 for a group of individuals to be treated collectively as a name bearer but, unlike syntypes, not further divisible by lectotype selection from among them (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 273).
27. To provide that in extant species of protozoa, when a taxon cannot be differentiated by a single individual (or a single preparation — B26 above), a suite of several preserved preparations of directly related individuals representing different stages in the life cycle may be designated as a holotype or neotype, or selected as a lectotype. Such a group of preparations would have the status of such a type (not

- syntypes). The term hapantotype is proposed to describe this category. The change proposed to Article 73 is an extension of that in B26 above. The proposal results from consultation with the same bodies (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35: 200).
28. That when a species-group taxon is found to be based upon syntypes and was previously wrongly thought to be based upon a single specimen, or when a single specimen is wrongly thought to have been a holotype, that specimen if previously cited in a published work as a holotype shall be deemed to be a lectotype. The Code Article 73 (a) provides that if a nominal species-group taxon is based on one specimen only, that specimen is the holotype, but if more than one specimen provides the basis, those specimens are of equal value in nomenclature (Art. 73 c). The Code makes no provision to protect the status of a name, previously stable because it was thought to be based upon a holotype, that becomes unstable through the discovery that it is based upon syntypes and vulnerable to subsequent selection of a different specimen as lectotype. Stability would be preserved in such cases by giving the specimen previously thought to be a holotype, the status of a lectotype, but protection against selection through mere listing would be provided through making the provisions of Article 73a(iii) apply (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 172).
29. To specify that the designation of a specimen to be a neotype other than in accordance with and under the conditions specified in the Code in the 'cases admitted' (2nd Edn Art. 75 a) is not a valid designation and the specimen so designated not a neotype. The Code Article 75 c lists qualifying conditions and specifies that a neotype is validly designated only when published with certain specified particulars. In addition (Art. 75 a) the Code states that a neotype 'is to be designated only in connection with revisory work, and then only in exceptional circumstances' that are specified, but it is not explicit that a neotype designated under circumstances other than those described in Article 75 a has no status in nomenclature. The proposal provides that neotypes designated in circumstances other than those admitted in the Code are invalid.
30. That the term 'epithet' be adopted for the second word of a binomen and the second and third words of a trinomen. The Special Session has considered the effect upon the Code of adopting the term 'epithet' for the second term of a binomen and the second and third terms of a trinomen. The

expressions 'specific name' (as used in the Code), 'name of a species', 'name of a species-group taxon', and 'name of a nominal species-group taxon' do not mean the same thing. The Code's present usage dates back to the old Règles. The Editorial Committee has adopted the term epithet in its published (6th) Draft. The effect upon comprehensibility produced by the proposal can be judged by inspection and comparison.

- C. **Matters referred by the Special Session of the Commission for discussion by the Section on Nomenclature and not forwarded to the Division of Zoology for ratification.**
1. That notwithstanding an academic dissertation (thesis) satisfies the provisions of Article 8 concerning reproduction, nature of issue and obtainability (8(2) (3) (4)), it is not published in the sense of the Code unless it includes a statement that it is issued publicly for permanent scientific record (Article 8).
 2. To require as a condition of availability for new names that the author shall have forwarded a copy of the work containing the name and the other conditions that make it available to the Zoological Record (or another specified publication) and for the new name and the bibliographic reference to it to be cited by the Zoological Record (or other specified publication) within a stated number of years (Article 8).
 3. That after (say 1980) it be required as a condition of availability for new names and acts affecting nomenclature that they be issued in a work in which the name of the publisher, the date of publication (Chapter V), and the name of the author (Chapter XI) are also printed (Article 8).
 4. That the Code also governs names based upon the work of animals irrespective of whether they were published after or before 1930.
 5. To include the term 'phenotype' with the terms 'variety' and 'form' as those terms whose use in connection with a name newly proposed after 1960 prevents availability (Articles 15 and 45 e).
 6. That as a means of determining whether a subsequent spelling is a justified emendation, to admit information derived from external sources other than an author's or publisher's corrigenda.

7. To provide that when the homonymy of two genus-group names of identical priority is discovered then that *used* for a genus is to take precedence over that used for a subgenus irrespective of the levels at which they were originally established.
8. To remove the requirement that the variant spellings of epithets listed in Article 58 of the Code must be of the same origin and meaning before they may be deemed to be homonyms.
9. To add to the list of variant spellings deemed to be homonyms, genitives based upon personal names that differ in spelling only because of the use of different systems of transliteration.
10. To provide that when a replacement name introduced before 1900 with a type designation different from that of the name it is proposed to replace has become universally employed in the sense of the type so designated, it shall not be a junior synonym of the name it is proposed to replace.

Unconfirmed minutes of the Meeting of the Section on Zoological Nomenclature of the Division of Zoology of IUBS, Helsinki, Finland, 22 August 1979. Z.N.(G) 189

The meeting was called to order by Dr. W.D.L. Ride, Chairman of the preceding meeting of the Section (Bangalore, 1976). The following agenda was adopted:

1. Election of Chairman
2. Minutes of previous meeting
3. Election of members of the Commission
4. Consideration of proposals for changes in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature
 - (a) presentation of French and English texts of the draft third edition
 - (b) proposals by the Commission on outstanding substantive changes to the second edition
 - (c) proposals by the Commission on other items:
 - (i) names for domestic animals
 - (ii) names of organisms regarded as both plants and animals

- (iii) possible standardisation of the use of the term 'nominal taxon' in the Code, or its possible removal
5. Proposed changes in the Constitution of the Commission
 6. Proposal to IUBS by the French national delegation concerning different systems of nomenclature
 7. Any other business.

1. On the proposition of Dr. Corliss, seconded by Dr. Sabrosky, Dr. W.D.L. Ride was elected Chairman.

2. The minutes of the previous meeting at Bangalore, 1976, were confirmed (see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 33: 188-189).

3. The slate of nominees for election to the Commission prepared by the Commission was presented as follows:

*Starobogatov	:	Bousfield
*Bayer	:	Maurin
*Corliss	:	Levine
*Melville	:	unopposed

(The names marked with an asterisk are those of retiring members of the Commission.)

The Commission expressed a preference for the candidates in the left-hand column, and wished to keep one place vacant. The four candidates recommended by the Commission were duly elected.

4a. The Secretary presented the French and English draft texts of the third edition. The Chairman explained the different principles involved at each of the three stages in amending the Code:

- (1) proposals came before the Section from the expert body (the Commission), taking into account any comments by zoologists;
- (2) the Commission's proposals could be examined in detail by the Section, which could veto any or all of them;
- (3) the Section's recommendations would be placed before the Division of Zoology, which had the duty of ensuring that any proposals for changes in the Code did not misrepresent the intentions of the Section.

Dr. Sabrosky urged that zoologists in the meeting place of IUBS should be informed in advance of the date and place of the Section meeting and be urged to apply to the Board of the Division of Zoology for recognition as members of the Section.

4b. Dr. Sabrosky presented the Commission's report on proposed changes to the second edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. He explained that these consisted of three lists: List A contained proposals that had already been published over a year (in November 1977) and that had received more than the required two-thirds majority vote in their favour by the Commission. He formally proposed the incorporation of the corresponding changes into the Code *en bloc* and this was *accepted*.

List B contained 30 proposals for changes in the Code that had all been published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, some for less than a year, so that the Commission could not vote on them. Others had been published for over a year, but had been deferred for further discussion. They had, however, been examined in depth by a special meeting of the Commission immediately before the General Assembly and had been endorsed by a general meeting of the Commission at Helsinki. Dr. Sabrosky said that the Section could veto any of the proposals in which event the Commission could not vote on them and the corresponding provision in the second edition would appear in the third edition of the Code. He proposed that each of the proposals that was not vetoed by the Section should be voted on individually by the Commission and presented to the Board of the Division of Zoology (if adopted by a two-thirds majority vote of the Commission) for final adoption or rejection. The suggested procedure was *accepted*.

List C contained 10 proposals that the special meeting of the Commission had recommended should not be adopted. Each would be submitted for a vote by the Commission, and, if the recommendation of the special meeting was upheld, would not be adopted. These proposals were *received* by the Section and *referred back* to the Commission. They would not be forwarded to the Division of Zoology at Helsinki.

4c(i). Dr. Sabrosky said that the Commission had received a proposal that names given to domestic animals as such should be excluded from the Code. The ensuing debate had not sufficiently clarified the issue and it was proposed to ask the Nomenclature Committee of the International Theriological Congress for advice. This was *agreed*.

4c(ii). Dr. Sabrosky explained the problem presented by

organisms that were considered by some zoologists to be animals and by others to be plants, and that were given different names accordingly, because their nomenclature was regulated by different criteria in the respective codes of zoological and botanical nomenclature. The Section was asked to present a resolution through the Division of Zoology to the General Assembly asking the Executive Committee of IUBS to set up a committee of representatives of all interested divisions to propose means whereby such organisms could have only one correct name, to whichever kingdom they were assigned. This was *agreed*.

4c(iii). Dr. Sabrosky explained that the Commission was not yet ready to present any concrete proposals concerning the use of the term 'nominal taxon' in the Code, but that Dr. Ride and Mr. Melville would try to reconcile their opposed viewpoints and report to the Commission. This was *accepted*.

5. Dr. Sabrosky reported that the changes in the Constitution of the Commission published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 174-175 had been given the necessary two-thirds majority approval by the Commission (*ibid.* vol. 36: 66-70) and formally moved their adoption by the Section. This was *agreed*.

6. The Section took note of a resolution proposed by the French delegation to the General Assembly that a committee should be set up to establish the differences in principle and approach between the various systems of regulation in biological nomenclature and agreed, with the support of the Commission, that it should be supported in the General Assembly.

7. There was no other business.

R.V. MELVILLE

Secretary

Section on Zoological Nomenclature

Helsinki

25 August 1979